



## South Cooper Mountain Concept & Community Plans

### Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3: Meeting Notes

**Corrected: 10-21-13**

**Date:** 9/19/2013

**Time:** 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

**Location:** First Floor Conference Room  
Beaverton City Hall  
4755 SW Griffith Drive  
Beaverton, OR 97005

**Attendees:** See attached.

### Presentations

Valerie Sutton went over the agenda for the meeting.

### Project Updates

Valerie presented a revised timeline, noting the time for the planning phase has been extended to the end of December 2014 to better align with the Metro CET grant and the milestones of the CET grant process.

A second timeline was prepared in response to questions received about timing of development of the South Cooper Mountain Annexation Area (SCMAA). The development timeline has no years associated with it, but the timeline does generally illustrate the City's complete development review process by monthly time estimates.

The reason why no specific starting year is illustrated on the development timeline is because there are a variety of unknowns which will influence development. Those unknowns include, but are not limited to:

1. The status of the Court of Appeals decision on the Urban/Rural Reserves LCDC decision;
2. The status of the Court of Appeals decision on the UGB expansion LCDC decision;
3. Potential appeal(s) of the South Cooper Mountain Plan;
4. The need to negotiate and enter into development agreements to fund and provide infrastructure;
5. The availability of infrastructure to support development.

For additional information, visit the project website at [www.BeavertonOregon.gov/SouthCooperPlan](http://www.BeavertonOregon.gov/SouthCooperPlan) or contact Valerie Sutton, City of Beaverton Senior Planner, at [vsutton@beavertonoregon.gov](mailto:vsutton@beavertonoregon.gov) or 503.526.2496.



There are many unknowns which makes it difficult for the City to say when development will begin. The City is committed to completing the planning study on time as illustrated in the revised timeline.

Valerie provided an overview of the correspondence from the attorney for the Crescent Grove Cemetery and the response to the correspondence provided by Steven Sparks. The time is not right to be assigning zoning to properties in the planning area and the current role of the advisory committees is to advise on the presented scenarios.

## Overview of Scenarios

Joe Dills explained the purpose of the meeting and what the committee members are expected to achieve at the meeting. Joe stated that the committee is not picking a preferred scenario at this stage but rather commenting on the pros and cons of each scenario.

Joe provided an overview of the three (3) scenarios for the planning area. Joe explained the characteristics of each development type and the transportation framework of each scenario. The slides from the presentation are available on the project website.

Joe concluded by asking each table to review the scenarios with the following questions in mind: Have we identified the issues correctly and completely? Are there regulatory issues to be aware of? What are the pros and cons of each scenario?

## Breakout Groups

### Sewer / Water / Storm Water Breakout Table comments

*Project Team members: Claudia Sterling (DEA) and Steve Sparks (City of Beaverton)*

#### Water

JWC and TVWD are working together to plan a regional water supply system. The high pressure treated water delivery line for the Willamette River water supply project will likely be coming up from the south within the Roy Rogers Rd/175<sup>th</sup> right-of-way. The water needs to be delivered to new water storage tanks located in the SCM area, then be piped from the storage location west towards Hillsboro. The team attempted to consider these pipeline needs when laying out the proposed collector road systems for each of the three scenarios so that the pipeline might be able to share the ROW.

Hillsboro Water and TVWD will have a better understanding of the design needs in the next 12-18 months when the design study is completed. The final location of storage and pipelines will be determined by the upcoming predesign study. Further coordination will be required to see if the shared ROW will work. If a 48" line is used, the right-of-way may be appropriate. However, pipe sizes and elevations for the water storage lines have not been determined with any accuracy. The hydraulic design parameters are still being refined; it is currently assumed the base of the terminal storage will need to be at +/- 450' EL and the centerline of the discharge pipeline to Hillsboro will be +/- 440' EL.



The system for delivery of water within the SCM was not discussed. The team is assuming that the water service loops proposed by City Public Works staff will be adjusted to conform to the final scenarios' roadway network prior to preparing cost estimates.

## **Sewer**

Carrie Pak (CWS) shared an email from Andy Braun outlining a few questions on the earlier versions of the Existing Conditions and Future Conditions memos prepared by the team.

She stated in general that CWS has no concerns about being able to provide sanitary conveyance and treatment to the SCM area, it was mostly a consideration for getting areas annexed into the District boundary so that service could be provided.

Since SCMAA is in the UGB, CWS can provide service but only after the area is also annexed into their boundary. Since SCMAA is already annexed into City of Beaverton, the City will have to manage providing sewers. A key recommendation that needs to be made in the final report is that the entire SCMAA must annex to CWS prior to any development taking place in the SCMAA.

Specific to North Cooper Mountain (NCM), which is within the UGB but unincorporated, NCM property owners could annex to CWS and have sewer service provided. Carrie stated that if property owners want to have sewer service, they will need to request to be annexed to CWS to get access to any existing sewer lines. This can be done on a property-by-property basis; it would not need to be the entire NCM area. There is a sanitary line being installed in SW Miller Hill Rd to serve a new JWC water well; residents cannot connect to this line currently because they are not annexed into the District boundary.

For the Urban Reserve Area, CWS could not provide service currently because the area is not in the UGB. To get service prior to the URA being added to the UGB, properties within the area that are adjoining annexed properties would have to annex to the City and be brought into the UGB. In that scenario, the City would be responsible for sewer lines similar to SCMAA. She stated Bethany is coming into the District "piecemeal" and that could be a strategy for URA areas adjoining either SCMAA or existing City sewered areas on the eastside.

## **Storm Water**

Carrie Pak (CWS) raised a concern about the proposed density of the SCMAA. She expressed the opinion that 15 units to the acre is too high. The density is not consistent with the surrounding communities in Beaverton and Tigard. Also, the density will provide a high degree of difficulty in providing adequate storm water treatment, particularly since the soils do not lend themselves to infiltration.

Steve explained the density requirements of the UGB expansion decision. While the total number of dwelling units is lower than what Metro specified in the UGB decision, the overall density is the key factor for the City to demonstrate compliance.



Carrie stated that the scenario report needs more discussion on what the City of Beaverton wants to see for the area from a storm water treatment perspective. Given the experience of other UGB expansion areas in Washington County, the need for erosion control protection and protection of riparian resources is critical. Carrie requested additional detail on how storm water is recommended to be treated in the SCMAA.

Carrie expressed concerns about the cluster development in the Creeks area (Scenario 3). She was not too concerned about the construction impacts because such impacts can be mitigated. Her concern is for long term viability of the highest quality resource area due to the proximity of residential development. Her experience is that cluster development does not work as intended and the protected areas become dumping grounds or private recreation areas.

A discussion was had on the proposed regional treatment ponds shown in the report as common to all scenarios. These are primarily located in the Urban Reserve area, and might not be constructed until some future time. A concern was raised about one pond where the catchment area straddles the UGB. The team agreed to show a new pond upstream of the SCMAA pond so that the lower pond could be sized to accommodate the SCMAA development and the upstream one (in the URA) could be built later and sized to match the associated development.

CWS would still own and maintain regional ponds. CWS is currently working on a new methodology for Regional Stormwater Approach Projects (RSAPs) including a fee system to recover the District's costs for construction. Their definition of a regional storm water facility at this point is flexible (no minimum footprint or associated drainage area); they would be based on the regional planning conducted for the issue. A regional facility depends on the treatment strategy and is based on need; a pond serving a high density area could still be considered a regional facility. They hope to adopt this approach on Oct 1 and publish on Oct 4.

Steve asked about the earthen dam on one of the creeks in SCMAA and if it should be removed. Currently in all the scenarios, the dam and resulting pond, wetland, and riparian area are considered to be an amenity for the future neighborhood (assuming some level of restoration). Steve expressed his concern about the City's potential cost to improve and maintain and the associated liability of the dam. One approach might be to find a way to remove the dam but still preserve some wetlands or riparian areas. Carrie said that Department of State Lands is the agency responsible for the permitting of dam removal and the resulting loss of wetlands and possibly the riparian area. They are working with DSL now on a similar issue (in unincorporated Bethany) and she concludes that DSL permitting is possible but not necessarily easy.

## Land Use, Transportation, Regulatory & Policy Compliance Table Notes

*Project Team members: Becky Hewitt (APG), Carl Springer (DKS Associates) and Valerie Sutton (City of Beaverton)*



The group discussed the regulatory issues surrounding planning for new roads outside the urban growth boundary (UGB). The key questions and conclusions included:

- Lidwien Rahman, ODOT representative, expressed concerns that the legal question of the relationship between Urban Reserves and the TPR (Transportation Planning Rule) has not been answered. This remains an open question.
- There were other comments from DLCD and Metro staff about the status of a concept plan – is it a land use decision, what effect do roads shown on a concept plan have on the TSP, if any, etc. The DLCD representative stated that if a concept plan does not amend or become part of the adopted comprehensive plan or transportation system plan (TSP), then it would not be considered a land use decision; however, any amendments to those plans to implement a concept plan would be considered a land use decision. This affects planning for new roads because it means that any new roads that will be incorporated into City or County TSPs would need to comply with state land use and transportation planning rules, but the concept plan itself may not be subject to those rules, depending on what status it is given by the city and county.
- Gordon Howard (DLCD) stated that a goal exception would be needed for a new roadway in urban reserves, ~~unless the new road affected only exception (non-resource) lands.~~<sup>4</sup> He also noted that transportation improvements in an area outside the UGB that are needed to serve areas within the UGB are treated differently. If roadway improvements through the urban reserve are only needed to serve future growth from the urban reserve, then they can wait until the UGB is expanded and the rules about transportation improvements outside a UGB will not apply. However, if the roadway improvements are needed to serve growth within the areas that are already in the UGB, then they would need to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule and potentially the goal exception process.
- Gordon referenced a definition of a roadway realignment in the TPR, which does not set limits on the length or degree of deviation from the existing roadway alignment, and noted that to his knowledge it has not been tested in court. This is relevant to both the two options for realignment of 175<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Scenarios 1 and 2 and to the realignment of Grabhorn Road through Rural Reserve land to avoid one of the 90-degree corners in all 3 scenarios.

Dan Rutzick, City of Hillsboro, asked if the transportation modeling will extend beyond the map contained in the existing conditions report. Carl Springer, DKS, indicated that the map showing the intersections to be evaluated comprised the “bubble” that will be modeled.

The group also discussed appropriate density in North Cooper Mountain:

---

<sup>1</sup> OAR 660-012-0065 (3)(g): “New access roads and collectors within a built or committed exception area, or in other areas where the function of the road is to reduce local access to or local traffic on a state highway. These roads shall be limited to two travel lanes. Private access and intersections shall be limited to rural needs or to provide adequate emergency access.”



- Dyami Valentine, Washington County, stated that the R5 is the lowest density land use designation currently available for urban Washington County, and that a new 1-acre lot designation for NCM would be contrary to county policies and not likely to be considered. He indicated that the county has rules in place to allow development on existing oversized lots so long as the layout does not preclude future development at the minimum density. He also pointed out that the County has policies and requirements related to sewer service, and that requiring sewer connections would make development at 1 unit per acre impracticable.
- Tim O'Brien, Metro, stated they are still working on the NCM density question, but that the very low density housing identified for NCM in Scenario 1 would not likely be well received by the Metro Council.
- Gordon stated that DLCD's point of view on density is that the Metropolitan Housing Rule (10 DUs/acre) would apply; however there was discussion of what would be considered a buildable acre for those purposes and whether it is intended to apply to each new urban area individually or to all new urban areas within Washington County collectively. These questions remain unresolved.

Gordon raised the issue of workforce housing at 50 units/acre and where that could be located. The project team indicated that workforce housing is assumed to be a component of the Urban Neighborhood in all scenarios, and that the 50 units/acre assumption was an estimate provided by Ramsey Weit of the Community Housing Fund, and affordable housing provider and member of the CAC.

Dyami said he would provide more specificity with regard to compliance with county transportation policies. He indicated that county policy is that intersections with arterial roads should be from other arterials or collector roads, and that local street connections are only allowed through an access management plan. This affects the local street connections off of arterial roads shown on the transportation framework maps for each scenario. He noted that the County TSP indicates local connectivity needs and that locations within the planning area could be added to those maps.

There was discussion about whether Grabhorn /Tile Flat should be classified as an arterial or collector, with pros and cons associated with each regarding compatibility with farm operations in the rural reserves on the west.

A question was raised about whether there could or should be a new north-south collector road identified through the East Hills area. The project team agreed to look into the feasibility of such a connection.

In discussing the pros and cons of each scenario, the group had the following additional comments:

Scenario 1:





- Gordon indicated that the alignment shown for 175<sup>th</sup> in Scenario 1 would face less arduous permitting because it does not affect resource land.
- Several indicated that the 1 unit per acre density in NCM is more realistic from a market and community acceptability perspective, although it is less realistic from a policy compliance perspective.

#### Scenario 2:

- The cost of new infrastructure for Scenario 2 was identified as a negative.
- An arterial through the community and location of the commercial node on the new arterial were identified as negatives.
- The level of protection for The Creeks natural areas was identified as a positive in Scenario 2, especially by Metro.
- Several commented that a bridge over the ravine near Kemmer Rd. for the 185<sup>th</sup> alignment in Scenario 2 would be preferable to the loop around the riparian area to the north and might provide better wildlife passage.

#### Scenario 3:

- Several participants stated a preference for the 175<sup>th</sup> to 185<sup>th</sup> alignment in Scenario 3.
- A concern was raised about potential parcelization impacts from the alignment of the new east-west collector road in Scenario 3.
- The western location of the commercial node was seen as both a positive and a negative – more separate from Progress Ridge but also on the edge of the urban area.

## Natural Resources, Parks, Trails, and Schools Table Notes

*Project Team members: Ken Pirie (WM) and Leigh Crabtree (City of Beaverton)*

### Natural Resources

Comments on natural resources included:

- Maintain 50 foot riparian buffers and work to minimize drainage crossings.
- General agreement with what is depicted in Figure 18 on page 29 of the Scenarios Report for Natural Resources Protection & Enhancement Priorities. THPRD staff recommended adding a priority wildlife connection between #8 and the north end of the stream connecting to #2. The importance of wildlife connections to areas outside the planning area, such as River Terrace as well as south and west to the Tualatin River was noted.



- Stream Enhancement Opportunities (#10 and #11 on Figure 18) could be mitigation for infrastructure development impacts in other areas and may be mitigation bank opportunities.

Metro and THPRD have funds through bond measure for willing seller purchases. One opportunity may be the Kobbe Farm, approx. 194 acres, south of CM Nature Park.

## Parks

A revised estimate of park needs based on population estimates for each scenario was provided to participants (and is available on the project website).

The group noted that more analysis and discussion is needed with regard to the number of parks and park sizes. With the projected population there may need to be more community park level of service than neighborhood parks. This is in part due to sports field demand and that school sites not intended to serve this function. For example, a 10 acre park that is flat may be better than 2, four acre parks. It was noted that the City of Hillsboro is looking at a 30 acre park in the Butternut area of South Hillsboro.

THPRD staff prefer Scenario 3 park locations, with the exception of the park divided by the street. Parks that are internal/central to neighborhoods are preferred, rather than along Arterials and Collectors. It was noted that the plan probably shouldn't count on the URA to serve park functions for the SCMAA.

Whether or not the proposed locations for facilities, specifically parks, are to be 'guaranteed' in the plan was discussed. The North Bethany Plan was developed with a system for some parks in fixed locations and other neighborhood/pocket parks in general areas as part of development requirements. The North Bethany example is different than the traditional system of districts finding funding and working through acquisition (some programs allow for condemnation). It was noted that it is good to establish what you want up front; fixing sites in regulation provides certainty and is better for districts than bubbles.

## Trails

Concerns were raised over aligning trails with roads. The park district prefers to keep trails away from streets; but also understands that this planning effort is different than prior trail development efforts. THPRD would like to see proposed cross-sections, details, separations. Associated comments and observations include:

- Will trails be separated from the roadway by a planting strip?
- THPRD's Trails Plan, Fig. 5, shows a cross-section with facilities on both sides of a road. The concept has potential for one side of road for a wider path.
- Bikes should not be on a sidewalk, not good for bike commuters.





- Weir alignment does not match the road framework alignment; why? Prefer not to have mid-block crossing; however, if the trail needs to meander for topography, will there be a safe trail crossing?
- Has this plan considered the 'Active Transportation Plan' that is under discussion? Some proposed regional bikeway trails (the highest level) are being proposed with a 14 foot wide surface (plus 2' of shoulders each side). Currently the plan is using adopted cross-sections.

THPRD is glad to see that the trails are planned outside of the Vegetated Corridor. The scenarios were drafted to minimize drainage crossings, stay out of riparian areas and utilize some ridges.

### Schools

The school district discussed issues related to forecasting future school needs. Development within both school districts is a challenge in forecasting the need for a new school in either district. Need to forecast the number of students and how the number will grow overtime (phasing). BSD does not have enough near term demand for an elementary school, given the proximity of existing schools. HSD's closest elementary school is Groner (approx. 3 miles west) in Scholls, they may need an elementary school before BSD.

Additional notes:

- The 'knoll' location may be too steep for elementary school.
- Scenario 2 shows a school in the URA, show in SCMAA
- Concern over the amount of land lost at the high school site due to riparian area over the northern portion

### Other

THPRD questioned why FU-10 the only 'Future Urban' designation shown in the scenarios. Staff and consultants explained that the scenarios are meant to be illustrative of possible densities and that other designations depicted are a continuation of designation from SCMAA, East Hills, and the NCM. Also, the process is not to level of planning to determine specific land use districts (County) or zoning (City).

Continuing the FU-10 discussion, THPRD questioned a 15 units/acre target in the URA, recollecting that Metro Title 13 resources are differentiated in the IGA for Urban Reserves. The result in the IGA is that resulting densities for URAs are to be no less than 10u/ac. A consultant relayed that Metro has not provided direction with regard to density outside of the SCMAA and noted there is a floor to the amount of density needed to fund infrastructure.

## Group Discussion of Pros, Cons, Changes & Recommendations

*Moderator: Joe Dills (APG)*



## Pros and Cons of Each Scenario

### Scenario 1

#### Pros:

- Some preservation of natural resources in Urban Reserve Area (URA)
- Western park has good views
- North Cooper Mountain (NCM) realistic
- Postpones need for sewer in NCM

#### Cons:

- Stormwater management challenge
- Western park location bad for active recreation
- NCM is low density - Metro Council may not accept NCM density
- NCM – County zoning issue: there is no zone for 1 acre lots
- Less transportation networks

### Scenario 2

#### Pros:

- Maximum protection of Creeks area
- More realistic compromise on NCM
- Not relying on Tile Flat and Grabhorn roads
- Visibility for commercial
- New collector provides direct route to Scholls Ferry Rd.

#### Cons:

- Showing school in URA
- School near knoll (need flat sites)
- Commercial node on arterial
- Park too close to arterial



- New arterial splits community

### Scenario 3

#### Pros:

- School, park, commercial node
- Parks internal to neighborhoods
- Possible buffer area between Grabhorn realignment
- Better connections to 185<sup>th</sup>
- NCM zoning consistency
- Higher densities off-set low density in NCM

#### Cons:

- Road splits park
- Urban neighborhood abuts Tile Flat – rural compatibility
- NCM unrealistic for 20-year horizon
- Cluster development does not always protect resources well (more burden on development review process)

### TAC Recommendation – Changes To Be Made Prior to Evaluation

1. Correct road through park (Scenario 3)
2. All scenarios should have an elementary school within the Beaverton School District boundary (correct Scenario 2)
3. Weir Road trail (remove switchback)
4. Break storm water ponds that straddle the urban growth boundary
5. Provide additional habitat connections (on the Natural Resource Protection and Enhancement Priorities Map, per notes from the topic table)

### TAC Consensus – Recommendation to CAC

The TAC recommends to the CAC that the three scenarios presented be forwarded into the evaluation process with the recommended changes listed above.

